

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
_	10/749,005	12/30/2003	Gregor K. Frey	6570P028	8386
	8791 BLAKELV SO	7590 02/26/200 KOLOFF TAYLOR &		EXAMINER	
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN 12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD			, aut as 1756 bs 1	ROCHE, TRENTON J	
SEVENTH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	20071110222	5, 611 900 20 1000		2193	
	SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
	3 MO	NTHS	02/26/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)					
		10/749,005	FREY ET AL.					
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
		Trenton J. Roche	2193					
	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address -					
Period fo	• •		ONTHIO OR THERTY (OO) DAY	· (0				
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. D period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailine ded patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NATE OF THIS COMMUNIO 136(a). In no event, however, may a re- will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON e, cause the application to become AB	CATION. Epply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communication ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status	•							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 L	December 2003.						
2a) <u></u> ☐	• —	s action is non-final.	•					
3)	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
•	closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims		•					
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application	1.						
,	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra							
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
•	Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are rejected.							
•	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.						
Applicat	ion Papers							
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examina	er.						
10)🛛	10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>30 December 2003</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.							
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the			<u></u>				
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119			•				
12)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:	n priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).	,				
۵,	1. Certified copies of the priority documen	nts have been received.						
	2. Certified copies of the priority documen		pplication No					
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prid	ority documents have been	received in this National Stage	;				
	application from the International Burea		•					
*	See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	t of the certified copies not	received.					
	·	•						
Attachme	nt(s)	· ·	•					
1) 🔯 Noti	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)					
· -	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)		s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application					
	er No(s)/Mail Date	6) 🔲 Other:						

Art Unit: 2193

DETAILED ACTION

- 1. This Office action is responsive to communications filed December 30, 2003.
- 2. Claims 1-12 are currently pending and have been examined.

Claim Objections

- 3. Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities: The claim improperly depends on itself. Appropriate correction is required. For purposes of examination, the Examiner assumes the claim is supposed to depend on claim 5.
- 4. Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities: The claim improperly depends on a later claim, that of claim 9. Appropriate correction is required. For purposes of examination, the Examiner assumes the claim is supposed to depend on claim 7.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

- 8. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:
 - Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.
- 9. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.
- 10. The invention as disclosed in claims 1-12 is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claimed invention as a whole must accomplish a practical application. That is, it must produce a "useful, concrete and tangible result." (State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group Inc., 149 F.3d at 1373, 47 USPQ2d at 1601-02.)

Art Unit: 2193

Page 3

8. Claims 1-12 are directed to a system comprising one or more log controllers for receiving one or more messages from an application, and a log manager coupled to the log controllers. No physical aspects of the system are disclosed however, and as such, the recited log controllers and log manager, and thus the "system," amount to nothing more than software or a computer program listing per se, in that none of the elements recited are computer components or statutory processes, as they are not "acts" being performed. Such claimed computer programs do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and hardware elements of a computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized, and as such are considered functional descriptive material not capable of execution and thus are not capable of producing a useful, concrete and tangible result as required by the State Street Formulation. It is recommended that the claims be amended to show interactions between the hardware components of the system (processor, hard drive, etc.) and the log controllers/log manager/logs (being executed/stored/etc. by the hardware).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 6. Claims 1 and 4-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,802,067 to Camp et al. ("Camp").

Art Unit: 2193

Per claim 1:

Camp discloses:

- one or more log controllers to receive one or more messages from an application wherein

each of the log controllers is a Java class that includes one or more subclasses or modules

Page 4

selected from a group comprising a category subclass to generate trace messages and a

location subclass to generate trace messages ("the public in terface to the message logging

framework is log interface 10 and log base class 15..." in col. 2 lines 58-59. Further,

"Console log class...file log class...null log class...are classed representing specific types of

logging destination...each of which extends log base class..." in col. 3 lines 17-20. Finally,

"written in the Java programming language..." in col. 5 lines 26-27.)

a log manager coupled to the log controllers to manage the log controllers ("log manager..."

in col. 4 line 65)

- one or more logs to which the received messages are forwarded ("logs messages to a file..."

in col. 3 line 24)

substantially as claimed.

Per claim 4:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Camp discloses storing logs in a database as

claimed (note col. 3 lines 27-31).

Per claim 5:

Art Unit: 2193

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Camp discloses a formatter as claimed (Note col. 4 lines 11-43.)

Per claim 6:

The rejection of claim 5 is incorporated, and further, note the rejection regarding claim 5. The transaction formatter is a trace formatter.

Per claim 7:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Camp discloses each of the logs include one oe more subclasses or modules selected from a group comprising a stream log, a file log, and a console log as claimed ("Console log class... file log class..." in col. 3 line 17).

Per claim 8:

The rejection of claim 7 is incorporated, and further, Camp discloses the file log and console log being subclasses of the stream log as claim ("Console log class...file log class...null log class...are classed representing specific types of logging destination...each of which extends log base class..." in col. 3 lines 17-20).

Per claim 9:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Camp discloses severity information as claimed ("severity message..." in col. 3 line 42).

Per claim 10:

The rejection of claim 9 is incorporated, and further, Camp discloses severity selected from a list comprising debug, path, info, warning, error, fatal and none as claimed (Note col. 3 lines 55-65).

Per claim 11:

Note the rejection of claim 10. Further, "Log base class 15 provides a means to process messages based upon their severity attributes, for example through filtering or monitoring methods." in col. 3 lines 32-34. As the base class is extended, the severity would be inherited by the classes that extend the base class.)

Per claim 12:

Note the rejection regarding claim 11. Further, note col. 3 line 66 to col. 4 line 10, which discloses the ability to restrict severity messages.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 8. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Camp.

Per claim 2:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, while Camp discloses the use of the Java language, Camp does not explicitly disclose a Java 2 Enterprise Edition (J2EE) engine. Office

Art Unit: 2193

Notice is taken that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the logging abilities of Camp in a J2EE environment, as this is simply a more specific application development environment based on Java, and is well known in the art at the time the invention was made. Such a combination would be obvious as it would allow a developer of a distributed Java system the capability of debugging the system.

Per claim 3:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Camp does not explicitly disclose logging routines for a kernel. Camp discloses that message logging is useful and "needed in development of software code and application to assist with testing, debugging, trouble shooting and the like." (Col. 1 lines 12-15). Office Notice is taken that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the logging abilities of Camp to log routines for a kernel, as this would enable a software developer to determine what is happening on the kernel level of the system in terms of debugging.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Trenton J. Roche whose telephone number is (571) 272-3733. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9:00 am - 5:30 pm.

Art Unit: 2193

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Trenton J Roche Examiner Art Unit 2193

TJR